



Arkansas Progressive Democrat Caucus Quarterly

January 2023



OUR MISSION

The Arkansas Progressive Democratic Caucus was established to create a majority coalition of progressive organizations, increase progressive voter turnout, amplify progressive voices, and enact social democratic policies within Arkansas state and local government.

The Arkansas Progressive Democratic Caucus (APDC) was also formed to bridge the gap between legislators and everyday working Arkansans. Our focus is to coordinate on a county level to develop voter education programming, poll station access, and civic mobilization in counties and communities that are habitually overlooked and underserved.

APDC is dedicated to building a broader, more diverse and engaged electoral base in Arkansas politics.

We want to hold our democratic leaders to their word to actually work for the people with public accountability, new leaders, and an empowered voter base. We can create positive political programs for stronger, more educated future democrats. We can overturn generations of business Democrats playing to the interests of profits.

We are aware of the deep historical structures of racism and oppression and strive to contribute to people's movements for sweeping changes and nonreformist reforms. We stand for dignity, democracy, social equity, cooperation, and environmental stewardship. We are abolitionists, believing that people can achieve excellence if they are enfranchised and afforded civil rights, living wages, and access to social goods, community support and solidarity.

ARKANSAS SCHOOL STAFF DESERVE **A RAISE.**

DEMOCRATS HAVE A PLAN.

State of Arkansas
94th General Assembly
By: House and Senate Democrats

A Bill

For an Act to be Entitled

**AN ACT TO AMEND THE PER-STUDENT
FOUNDATION FUNDING AMOUNTS**

\$42 Million

INVESTMENT IN SCHOOL STAFF

\$15 per hour

MINIMUM PAY FOR CLASSIFIED STAFF



CALL TO ACTION



**TELL YOUR LEGISLATOR
TO RAISE STAFF PAY NOW
AND PASS THE RAISE ACT OF 2023**

& SEPARATE FROM DESTRUCTIVE EDUCATION REFORMS LIKE VOUCHERS!

Photo credits

Front Cover, Page 3 and 4 photos from Gayle Brock with the Ballot Box Initiative

Page 5 photo from Adam Black

Page 11 photo from Jim Wallace

Back cover photo from Alison Guthrie with Indivisible Little Rock and Central Arkansas

Page 5 public education infographic from Jenny Petty

SB43 targets drag and freedom of expression



A bill targeting drag performances in Arkansas, which passed the Senate Jan. 24, has far-reaching implications for everyone in the state. Senator Stubblefield and Representative Bentley announced the proposed SB43 on January 5, 2023.

The legislation is titled : “an act to classify a drag performance as an adult-oriented business; to add additional location restrictions to an adult-oriented business; and for other purposes.” This bill removes our freedom of choice and infringes upon freedom of expression and speech. This bill directly targets drag performers, but has far-reaching implications for everyone, especially women and anyone who performs in theater. We could go as far as comparing

the effects of this bill to Nazi Germany who targeted minorities who did not conform to the cisgendered, straight, white, Christian, nationalist identity.

Section 1 of the bill lists drag performances as inherently “adult-oriented” in nature. Drag performances are beautiful and creative, engaging in the deeply rooted American value of free expression, guaranteed to all of us by the First Amendment. Drag performance is radically diverse, beautifully artistic, welcoming, and belongs to every American, regardless of age, gender, or sexuality. Targeting drag performances is an attempt to restrict and undermine the freedom of expression and liberty of the inclusive and

creative LGBTQIA+ community. We believe the purpose is to codify Stubblefield and Bentley’s opinion that drag, and more generally any expression of gender that does not conform to the gender expression generally attached to a person’s sex assigned at birth is a type of public indecency or sexual obscenity.

Furthermore, especially considering how many drag performers are part of the LGBTQIA+ community, we believe the ultimate purpose of this bill and all similar bills both in Arkansas and across the United States are intended to make all expression of LGBTQIA+ identities out to be public indecency.

This bill as written, without any

additional interpretation would impact all performing arts, not just those that are billed and intended as drag shows. In Section 2 of the bill, the legislators define drag performance as one in which one or more performers “exhibits a gender identity that is different from the performer’s gender assigned at birth using clothing, makeup, or other accessories that are traditionally worn by members of and are meant to exaggerate the gender identity of the performer’s opposite sex.” This part of the bill implies that women can’t take male roles in theater, and vice versa, even if there’s a

shortage of men or women to fill out roles.

This bill attempts to dictate what is gender-conforming attire.

This bill will be a stepping stone for legislating what women can and can’t wear, perhaps regressing us back to the 1950s when women were only permitted to wear pants if temperatures dipped below a certain point. Many women feared wearing pants and not having enough female-deemed attire on, which was a crime before the 1969 Stonewall Riots. Will women be able to wear men’s clothes like basic t-shirts? Can women wear ties? How will

this be enforceable?

Many questions arise based on the verbiage of this bill. Who gets to decide what is drag? Who will be the fashion-arbiters from the legislature? What are the punishments and who enforces the law?

Going back to referring to drag as a “prurient” interest, many forms of entertainment can be tailored to fit different audiences. Movies, music, theater, comedy, and dance can range from family-friendly to adult-only audiences. Drag is absolutely no exception to this concept.

Cont. on page 5



SB43, continued from page 4

Drag is simply a way to put on a costume and present a character to an audience and there's a plethora of different genres and aspects to drag that people like Sen. Stubblefield and Rep. Bentley wouldn't care to educate themselves on simply because it primarily involves the LGBTQIA+ community.

SB43 passed the senate committee unanimously on Thursday, January 19 and the Senate on Jan. 24.

Jonesboro State Senator Dan Sullivan suggested that a restaurant like Hooters is a family-friendly establishment while at the same time suggesting a restaurant hosting a drag show is not family friendly. This is no longer about the art of drag itself, but instead it is an attack on the freedoms and liberties of queer people across the state of Arkansas. Sen. Stubblefield in an interview on NPR on the morning of Thursday, January 19 stated that police will be the arbiters of enforcement. Will

police, who serve communities including queer folks, now become the moral police?

This bill should be frightening to everyone regardless of where you sit on the political spectrum. It's an intrusion into our daily lives that the government should stay away from.

Chenoa Summers, community organizer in Jonesboro
Arkansas Progressive Democrats
Kayla Morrow, drag show organizer in Jonesboro
Vara Voss, drag queen from Jonesboro
Sasha SueSage, drag queen from Jonesboro
Erika Askeland, educator
Janice Marie, Greenbrier Pride, Drag Fairy Godmother
Renay Williams, community organizer in Jonesboro

<https://www.arkleg.state.ar.us/Bills/FTPDocumentpath=%2FBills%2F2023R%2FPublic%2FSB43.pdf>



Current Public Ed Legislation To Watch	
HB 1268 Filed by Rep McCullough (D) \$50K minimum teacher salary \$10K raises for all teachers	SB 149 Filed by Sen Leding (D) \$15 per hour minimum pay for all classified school employees
HB 1204 Filed by Rep Wooten (R) Private schools that accept vouchers must provide transportation for students within 35 miles	HB 1205 Filed by Rep Wooten (R) Private schools must admit students that apply w/vouchers; must give annual student assessments
HB 1192 Filed by Rep Eubanks (R) Will place state educational co-ops under governor and legislature appointed control	LEARNS Bill "Not yet filed" This approximately 150 page piece of legislation will allegedly include private school vouchers, a modest \$40K minimum teacher salary/\$4K raise, a potential teacher merit pay system, and increased ABC pre-k funding. SHS' website gives vague information about this bill.
SB 81 Filed by Sen Sullivan (R) Establishes the possibility of misdemeanor and Class D felony charges/creates the possibility of civil action against librarians for content deemed "obscene"	

"Truth" in sentencing act is just a waste of money and a push for more mass incarceration

This legislative session could see Arkansas' budget surplus blown on millions for private prisons and mass incarceration.

The "Truth in Sentencing and Parole Reform Act of 2023" (HB1002/SB2) is a bicameral "shell bill" proposed to be drafted in the upcoming general legislative session and sponsored by Representative Gazaway(R-Paragould) and Senator Gilmore(R-Crossett). There are few details published within the proposed bill, and the wording in the proposal seems intentionally ambiguous, but Progressive Caucus analysts have found a few press releases which outline what will likely be included in this bill.

In an Arkansas Online article, a spokesperson for the Huckabee-Sanders administration commented on the incoming administration's intended public safety plan, including details on the intended effects of HB1002/SB2.

If passed, it would affect formerly incarcerated people who have been let out on parole who commit future crimes. The severity of the future crimes was not stated in the press release, which is disturbing because it could mean that somebody out of a

50 years to life sentence for good behavior could be sent back to prison for a misdemeanor. Also, there will likely be a push to set a high mandatory minimum time that all convicted people must serve, with no accounting for credits for time served. The newly proposed mandatory minimum would be raised from between 38-60% to 80% of the maximum sentence. This means keeping more poor people behind bars for longer sentences.

This all comes with a not-so-hidden purpose. According to Talkbusiness' Roby Brock, Republican legislators have been discussing building a new 1,000 bed prison. Senate President Pro Tempore Bart Hester made statements about the state needing as many as 3,000 prison beds. If the Huckabee-Sanders backed prisoner retention bill could increase the holding capacity by 3000 beds, the for-profit prison industry would make approximately \$62,745,000 extra per year. This would take up a significant part of the budget surplus.

However, with the ultra-rightwing push to cut taxes and expand privatization, they will likely push to offset this almost 63 million dollar

tax burden by cutting rehabilitation programs, public education infrastructure, and any other social programs that have still resisted corporate takeover.

If the Republican party wants to increase spending on law enforcement or public safety, then expanding treatment programs, job placement, and counseling services would certainly do better for people than putting them in cells for more of their lives.

We have to deprioritize lining the pockets of prison administrators over building working programs to cut crime and decrease prison recidivism.

If you are a State Senator or House Member, we encourage you to vote no on any parts of this bill that waste taxpayer money to expand prisons without looking into proven means for cutting recidivism such as counseling, halfway homes, job training, and job placement programs.

If you are not an elected official, we urge you to contact your local state representative. You can find their emails and phone numbers here:

<https://www.arkleg.state.ar.us/Legislators>

Ashley County: Crossett's gift to the world



Public domain image

A water-filled borrow pit before it was drained as part of a malaria control project in Hamburg, Ashley County, AR in 1916

Down near the border of Louisiana, in the swampy and heavily wooded region of Arkansas, is Ashley County.

Before the advent of widespread and universal anti-malaria programs, the locals of Ashley County faced a life in which the spring and summer would bring widespread Malaria. This would, at best, keep the people living there quarantined for 2-3 weeks and, at worst, reduce the county's population by hundreds at a time. In a time where any loss of a person was felt by the whole community, these malaria seasons were particularly devastating.

It wasn't until the beginning of the industrial age that eradication of common but deadly diseases became seen by the general public as

legitimately possible. Support for the projects grew, at first through extremely wealthy families' charity work and eventually by the Federal Government. After the success of J. D. Rockefeller's Hookworm Eradication Project, their focus turned to Malaria as the next big disease which they and the newly formed Arkansas State Board of Health wished to see either significantly controlled if not entirely eliminated.

The process was not easy. Dr Frank B. Young described malaria in Arkansas as "economically the most harmful" and said that in order to control the issue, the state must undertake not only state sponsored clinics for patients but also earthwork projects designed to destroy mosquito breeding sites. He also

recommended placing community doctors at the forefront of widespread and persistent education campaigns for their localities in order to build general awareness for anti-malaria practices. Having proposed something similar in a 1911 book on southern diseases, Dr William Deadrick took this newly developed program from Dr Young to the J. D. Rockefeller Commission and the US Public Health Service.

With the program in hand Dr Rudolph Ezdorf, who headed the USPHS, began preliminary ground work surveying potential test sites for the project. He declared that the project should focus on two issues, control of the mosquito population along the Mississippi River and establishing demonstration sites to determine national viability of the program. He proposed both Chicot County as the site for the rural demonstration and the town of Crossett in Ashley County for the urban demonstration. When Dr Roberts Derivaux replaced Ezdorf as head of the USPHS, he immediately pushed forward with this project. His office determined all potential mosquito breeding sites in Crossett and, during the summer of 1916, his department had dug new and cleared almost 20,000 yards of ditches in the area. The project had

started off strong.

By the end of 1916, results of these efforts had shown incredible results. In Crossett, the reports of new malaria infections went from 2,500 in 1915 to just 741 by the end of 1916.

Crossett's health benefits were so pronounced that the town was declared to be "virtually free of Mosquitos," with the Crossett Lumber Company declared the project had "practically eliminated malaria." This not only helped saved many lives, but helped to revitalize the town by creating a savings of \$.75 per capita cost for physician visits, equivalent to over \$20 per person today and about \$50,000 modern for the whole town. This was a stark difference in the nation cost for economic damage caused by disease, which averaged about \$1 per capita more than the average seen by these test sites. The benefits of these potential health projects were more than clear.

The international medical community took quick notice and, after receiving these phenomenal results from the project in Crossett and Chicot, the International Health Board began in earnest to try and expand these across the whole state of Arkansas and the southern US.

Wickliffe Rose, head of the IHB, pushed for more funding and program take over by the state and federal government in order to push for malaria's total

eradication in the United States.

Unfortunately, the projects were mostly looked over and considered non-essential by local governments. Towns in Arkansas that had used IHB resources to initiate the anti-malaria project had typically ended funding for it before the projects were completed, leading predictably to a resurgence of the disease.

With two world wars upending domestic life, the United States had a need to keep workers who were not heading to European frontlines from getting sick and affecting wartime supply.

As such, the US pushed massive increases in healthcare investments for projects such as the anti-malaria one in Crossett.

The Department of Defense in 1916 used the Crossett projects plans for anti-malarial work in Pulaski, Lonoke, and Perry counties in order to keep the new military bases from having to be affected by rampant disease and bringing those diseases over to Europe during deployment.

This was unsurprisingly successful, leading to similar decreased infection rates that were seen in Crossett decades earlier.

From the start of the Great Depression in 1929 until FDR initiated the Public Health

Services Act of 1944, healthcare funding took a back seat to most other programs. The Depression Era focus on economic

revitalization necessitated the majority of domestic spending to be used for keeping folks from starvation and rampant unemployment.

When the US economy geared back up after the declaration of war against the Axis powers in 1941, the DoD required the reinstatement of the Crossett Project in order to keep Prisoner of War camps from having major outbreaks of disease.

These DoD projects were again very successful, and from then on the Department of Health maintained consistent funding of anti-malaria projects.

In 1953, the United States Department of Public Health declared Malaria no longer a major threat in the State of Arkansas.

While the Crossett Project was consistently fraught with funding struggles, the work that was done in Ashley County had never been in doubt.

In every instance that this program was initiated and maintained, Malaria infection rates significantly decreased and stayed low or non-existent until those project funds were removed.

The success became not only a national model but one that was used internationally to reduce and eliminate the major threat of the disease.

The people of Crossett, and Ashley County as a whole, should feel immense pride in knowing that the work done there has saved potentially millions of lives.



POLITICAL PLATFORM

Medicare for Y'all

- Free healthcare at point of service for all people in Arkansas
- Elimination of existing medical debt
- Abortion is a right and a choice free of state interference
- Regulate insurance and pharmaceutical companies to eliminate predatory practices
- Hospital stays determined solely on the advisement of medical professionals
- Increase state funding for healthcare education and training
- Increase the amount of healthcare workers
- Substantial pay for healthcare workers
- As state options overtake private insurance, offer retraining for insurance agents
- Remove businesses' requirements to pay for worker healthcare immediately upon passing state or federal universal healthcare

Love our Labor

- Minimum wage increase to a true living wage
- Future wage increases indexed to inflation
- Removal of "Right to Work" laws
- Official recognition that workers are the lifeblood of the state
- State guaranteed Right to a Job
- Increase enforcement and penalties for businesses that violate current labor regulations
- Penalize businesses that harass or terminate employees for attempting collective bargaining
- Reduce taxes paid by worker cooperatives to incentivize growth of co-ops
- State funds for retraining oil & gas workers on renewable energy

Infrastructure, Energy and Housing for Y'all

- Heavily invest in highspeed light rail networks with at least one line going to each county
- Municipal bus services for towns of at least 5,000 people
- Mandate Solar panels on all new buildings for large-scale development
- State funding for renewable energy production for all small-scale development
- Increase taxes on out of state real estate investors
- Ten year cap on property tax collection for individuals and families who own one residence
- End property taxes for used vehicles after 5 years of ownership
- Enact a Renters Bill of Rights
- Reduction of State recognized Parklands must be placed to a vote of residents in the counties in which the parks reside
- Free State provided hunting licenses in county and municipal clerks offices
- Removal of license requirements for recreational fishing
- Construct new public housing
- Cease the sale of all public housing to private interests
- Fully fund existing public housing including maintenance and repairs
- Economically develop depressed and underserved areas without displacing or extracting wealth from the preexisting community
- Eliminate the need for net metering by having the state take over energy companies
- Separate the State Department of Energy from the Department of Environmental Quality and eliminate red tape that makes cross department work more difficult

Y'all Means All

- State Constitutional Amendment affirming the civil rights of LGBTQIA2+ individuals within and outside the state
- Expand DREAM Act participants to include adults within the state of Arkansas
- Migration defined as a human right under the Arkansas State Constitution
- Felons given their right to vote at no extra cost or undue burden
- Remove the state law that disallows "Sanctuary Cities"
- State Constitutional Amendment stating that all religions are given equal protection under the law, with no exception for one religion over another
- State Constitutional amendment stating Education is a Human Right at all levels
- Automatic voter registration at the age of 18
- Voter registration updates being automatic when updating state IDs or licenses
- Voter rolls only removed by request of registrant or if the state can positively determine that the registrant has either moved or deceased
- Designate White Nationalist groups, as defined by the Southern Poverty Law Center, as terrorist organizations

A citizen's petition to limit the powers of a supermajority in the Arkansas Legislature



Jim Wallace

Is it a problem to have a supermajority of the same political party in both houses of the

legislature? Most of us would say that "as long as the party in power is my party then no, a super majority is not a problem".

It is a problem for everyone because we cease to have a balance of power to serve as a check on the legislative branch. As a supermajority party can push their agenda to extremes, the executive branch is prevented from intervening with any veto power.

Additionally the party in power can waste taxpayers dollars on pork barrel projects, frivolous exercises in symbolic acts or even pass laws that are harmful to citizens and their rights and damaging to the economy. Meanwhile, many needs of taxpayers go unaddressed.

We have heard politicians say that they will reach across the aisle to build a bipartisan consensus. Is this just lip-

service met with smirks and knowing winks and nods? The present system offers no real incentive to work with opposing members simply because it is intentionally designed to be adversarial in nature.

As a supermajority writes and passes bills that the governor cannot veto, then a significant step toward absolute power has been taken and it is corrupting absolutely as Lord Acton once observed. One might observe that in the presence of supermajority there is an increase in the number of bills proposed and the character of those bills exemplifies the race to the bottom of the barrel of immorality.

Beginning January 1, the Arkansas legislature's Democratic Party representation will be officially reduced to 6 of 35 state senators and 17 of 100 house representatives, (down from 7 and 23 respectively). Last week, the Republicans increased limits on the Democrats' participation on committee assignments and voted to keep the most senior members of the senate assembly from chair positions in the fourth caucus.

These chair positions traditionally have been taken by the senior members to make best use of their institutional experience and knowledge but apparently those qualities are no longer sought after.

So what should we do?

Here is a suggestion for requiring a bipartisan majority by increasing the requirements to achieve veto-proof bills. As simply put, the majority vote for a bill

would also require a minimum of votes from the minority members of each legislative chamber in order to qualify to be veto-proof. The total vote count to pass a bill would then be a blend from two or more political parties and Independents.

Let me explain how this would work. We can use the present makeup of the Arkansas legislature which has Republicans in 29 out of 35 seats, Democrats in 6 seats. A veto-proof bill with three-quarters voting "aye", the Republicans have easily enough members. My proposed change to this system would require that some of the votes in favor must come from the non-Republican members. Working with a proposed fraction of one-third of the non-Republicans in the senate, then 3 of the 6 members (Democrats and/or the Independent if there were any) need to be included in the vote to obtain veto-proof status. In this scenario we can see that the Republicans would only need 24 of their 29 states senators to vote in favor. If this proposal is passed into law then 3 non-Republicans must join in favor to establish a veto-proof bill. In the case of the State House of Representatives there are now 83 Republicans and 17 Democrats, so a veto-proof vote would require one-third or six, non-Republican members crossing the aisle to lend support. The fraction of one-third of the non-majority members is negotiable and is used here to illustrate how the system might be applied.

Why should we sign this petition?

Currently the sponsors of bills need only to convince their own supermajority members.

The intention here is to shift that focus to include others across the aisle to join them. I suspect, and hope, that this would have some impact on the intent of bills to be more inclusive. To be clear, this proposal would not change the votes

required to pass a bill in the legislature, but only to require bipartisan support to render the bill veto-proof in the presence of a supermajority in either chamber. In the presence of a mostly Republican legislature and a Democratic governor I believe this could be very important.

What are the challenges to implementing this idea? An amendment to the state constitution would be required and in our state this would likely solicit an immediate outcry of protest because "there have been so many amendments to the constitution!".

The counter-argument is simply that the Constitution itself does not state or imply there is to be a limit to the number of amendments (and this would be consistent with recognizing the constitution as a living document). In light of dispensing with that red herring it is probable that the party in power in the legislature will not be enamored with this proposal so long as they enjoy galloping reinfree with their stampede of a supermajority. As the politics of our state change with the winds of time, we will likely see a supermajority of another party one day. Given that possibility, I should think that those in the supermajority today would be far-sighted enough to be supportive. An amendment of this nature is proposed without bias, but with an egalitarian approach to prevent too much political party power shifting into one branch of government or one political party. In anticipation of those who might (will?) speak out against the concept, such defiance is a clear admission of opposition to nonpartisanship and even the doctrine of might is right.

Hopefully the citizens can learn to appreciate the benefits and support a ballot petition to amend their constitution to build in a limitation on

Continued on page 13

Petition, continued from page 12
the powers of a supermajority political party. The current system incentivizes an adversarial relationship as the balance of power has shifted.

Is There Potential To Do More?

The next step to advance bipartisanship in the legislature would be to set a minimum of votes from the non-minority members. This would apply

to simple majority requirements to pass any bills.

What Can Interested Citizens Do Now?

An additional challenge is to simplify the above explanation as a benefit to voters to prepare an easy to comprehend petition. Further work needs to be done to write the legal language needed for a ballot petition.

Why Does This Matter With S.H. Sanders As

Governor?

Again, the proposal has long term implications. As an amendment it would far outlive Sanders. In the short term we have yet to see how the legislature and executive branch will cooperate.

At the best pace, the petition would not come up for a vote until 2024 and if passed then not be effective until the last half of her term.

Caucus members beat projections in midterms

Here we will do a more in depth look at what the Caucus was anticipating in each of our own members' elections as well as some key statewide elections. We will be explaining our thought process in why certain races were given the percentages they were given as well as some of the reasons further adjustments were made as the campaigns went through their activities.

State Senate District 20:

Chenoa Summers

Caucus Estimate: 28-32%

Updated: 30-34%

Actual: 37.65%

Starting in the Senate D-20 race, Chenoa Summers came into the race as a relative newcomer to the campaigning process.

Having done work in the



fight to save the Craighead County library system's funding, she had an initial though still small name recognition. Having spent time in D-20 leading up to the election, the Caucus leadership made note to the lack of enthusiasm from the general public for

the Democratic Party in general.

Chenoa Summers, while showing talent in rallying a sleeping base, had a significant hurdle in this regard.

Her and her team had to overcome decades of no Democratic candidate in this district, and a lack of party engagement for most other races in the district. Because of these issues, we had an initial election result estimate placed at 25-30%.

From late August into September, we adjusted this estimate to 30-34% because of the skill Chenoa's campaign team showed in engaging the voters.

Her team was able to increase phonebanking

and canvassing volunteers through a dedicated social media presence, through Chenoa maintaining an issues based campaign as well as tying her campaign to local initiatives. We would have continued to increase the estimate but a somewhat muted debate and townhall performance left us with an impression that there would still be a lower than necessary turnout to justify it.

State Senate District 17:
David Barber
Caucus Estimate: 30-35%
Actual: 41.3%



Our initial thoughts on D-17 was concerning the obvious gerrymandering issues represented by the dilution of a younger more college oriented growing voter base Conway with a significantly more conservative wealthy white base in West Little Rock. The exclusion of Maumelle almost entirely from this

oddly shaped district but the addition of conservative rural Mayflower also informed our initial prediction to be fairly low at 30-35%. David Barber himself did not factor into our initial prediction, as our experiences with the voters in this district indicated there would be a lack of increased turnout for the GOP candidate on his name alone, and thus David Barber's relative lack of name recognition and engagement in the districts constituency before the campaign did not have weight on the assessment.

While David's campaign team was less active and participatory than Chenoa's, David himself put in the work. His general understanding of campaigning and his ability to recognize a working program, then shift his campaign over to it, showed promise.

This was undermined, to our own estimate, by David's campaign focusing on the city of Conway instead of working on engaging rural non-voters in between the two population centers.

We also did not increase our estimate because of any lack of town hall or debate to bring the campaign to the general public

State House District 69:
Zachary Culp
Caucus Estimate: 20-25%
Actual: 30.9%



Zachary joined the caucus late in the cycle, as such our estimation on D-69 came late in the cycle, around the middle of October.

Our initial look into this district was that Maumelle, while a rapidly growing area, was still going to be overshadowed by the vast rural nature of the rest of the district.

We had not seen any actual Democratic work in Maumelle or those rural spots previous to Zachary joining the Caucus, so our initial estimation was fairly low.

We began at 20-25%, not only for the previously mentioned issue, but also due to Zachary's lack of campaign experience and zero name recognition.

A woman with blonde hair tied back, wearing a denim jacket and a rainbow flag, is smiling and holding a white sign. She is surrounded by other people in a crowd, suggesting a protest or rally. The background shows a clear blue sky and some buildings.

LOVE
IS NOT YET
PERFECT
IN ONE WHO IS
AFRAID.

I JOHN 4:18

